



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/581,847 06/19/00 SANDER

R MERCK-2114

EXAMINER

PAK, J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1616

4

DATE MAILED: 11/22/00

HM12/1122  
MILLEN WHITE ZELAND & BRANIGAN  
ARLINGTON COURTHOUSE PLAZA I  
2200 CLARENDON BOULEVARD  
SUITE 1400  
ARLINGTON VA 22201

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/581,847

Applicant

SANDER

Examiner

John Pak

Group Art Unit  
1616



- ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

## Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- ☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_
- ☒ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 3
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 1616

Claims 1-17 are pending in this application.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combined teachings of Cropu abstract 92-82810 and CABA 76:32337.

Cropu abstract 92-82810 disclose the benefit of UV-reflective properties against Aphid and thrip populations.

CABA 76:32337 similarly discloses property of reflecting surfaces against aphids.

One having ordinary skill in the art would have recognized from these teachings that it is the reflective properties of a substance that has effect on the insects, not the identity of a particular substance per se. Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to utilize other light reflecting substances such as those recited in the instant claims to obtain similar insect protecting effect.

Therefore, the claimed invention, as a whole, would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time invention was made, because every element of the invention has been collectively taught by the combined teaching of the references.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner J. Pak whose telephone number is (703) -308-4538. The

Art Unit: 1616


examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday from 8 AM to 5:30 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jose Dees, can be reached on (703) -308-4628. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) -308-4556.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) -308-1235.

Pak/LR

November 9, 2000

  
JOHN PAK  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 1600